

**Dated 12/26/2006**

Reply to Office Action of 08/25/2006

### REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action mailed on 08/25/2006. In the Office Action, (i) claims 1-8, 10-16, 21-24, 26-31 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e); (ii) claims 4, 11, 16, 24, and 31 were objected to for informalities; and (iii) claims 9, 17-20, 25 and 32-35 were objected for being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Reexamination and reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the remarks made herein.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-5, 9, 11, 15-16, 21, 24, 27, and 31 by this response. No new claim has been added. Claim 35 has been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-34 are now pending.

Of the pending claims, claims 1, 5, 15, 21, and 31 are independent claims.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this response.

#### D) Claim Objections - Informalities

In section 2 of the Office Action, claims 4, 11, 16, 24, and 31 were objected to for informalities.

Regarding claims 4, 11, and 24, it was suggested that “the design” be changed to --the sequential logic design”. Applicant has amended these claims accordingly by this response. Claims 9 and 27 were similarly amended even though they were not objected to.

Regarding claim 16, the Markush group claim format was objected to. Applicant has amended claim 16 accordingly by this response.

Regarding claim 31, the legend “(Previously Presented)” was used in the last office action even though claim amendments were present. Applicant has re-submitted the prior last claim amendments and including those made by this response in claim 31 with the appropriate legend to show all the claim amendments that have been made.

In view of these amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim rejection is now moot.

II) Claim Objections - Rejected Base Claims

In section 19 of the Office Action, claims 9, 17-20, 25 and 32-35 were objected for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Office Action indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten into independent form.

Instead of rewriting dependent claims 9, 17-20, 25 and 32-35 into independent form, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5, 15, 21, and 31 by adding the clock sequence limitation of claim 35 into each in order to gain allowance of all claims 1-34.

Applicant has cancelled claim 35 without prejudice as its limitations have been added into claim 1 as well as independent claims 5, 15, 21, and 31.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection is now moot as to claims 9, 17-20, 25 and 32-35 and respectfully requests its withdrawal.

III) Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In sections 5-18 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10-16, 21-24, and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by “A Trace-Based Method for Delay Fault Diagnosis in Synchronous Sequential Circuits”, by Girard et al., IEEE, 1995, pages 526-532 (“Girard”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5, 15, 21, and 31 to include the limitation of claim 35 to further claim that “the clocking sequence is an ordered series of steps including scan operations, primary input force events, clock pulses, and measure events”.

As claim 35 was indicated as containing allowable subject matter in section 19 of the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 5, 15, 21, and 31 and their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the 35 USC 102(e) rejection of claims 1-8, 10-16, 21-24, and 26-31 over Girard.

**Dated 12/26/2006**

Reply to Office Action of 08/25/2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested.

If a Notice of Allowance is not forthcoming, Applicant respectfully requests an examiner interview.

Applicant's undersigned counsel can be reached by telephone at (714) 768-6804 to expedite the prosecution of this case should there be any unresolved matters remaining.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. If any other petition is necessary for consideration of this paper, it is hereby so petitioned.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: December 26, 2006

/William E. Alford/  
WILLIAM E. ALFORD; Reg. No. 37,764